

A NOTE ON Σ -PURE INJECTIVE MODULES

SIMION BREAZ

ABSTRACT. We prove that a right R -module M is Σ -pure injective if and only if $\text{Add}(M) \subseteq \text{Prod}(M)$. Consequently, if R is a unital ring, the homotopy category $\mathbf{K}(\text{Mod-}R)$ satisfies the Brown Representability Theorem if and only if the dual category has the same property. We also apply the main result to provide new characterizations for right pure-semisimple rings or to give a partial positive answer to a question of G. Bergman.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that purity plays a central rôle in the study of module categories. In particular (Σ) -pure injective/projective modules are used in order to describe various properties for subcategories of a module category. For instance the pure-semisimplicity (i.e. all modules are pure-injective) of $\text{Mod-}R$ can be characterized in many ways. However, there are many open problems connected with these notions.

We approach in this note some of these problems. It was proved by L. Angeleri, H. Krause and M. Saorin that $\text{Prod}(M) \subseteq \text{Add}(M)$ if and only if M is Σ -pure injective and product-rigid (see [1, Section 4.2] and [7, Section 3]), and this implies $\text{Prod}(M) = \text{Add}(M)$. Recall that $\text{Prod}(M)$ (resp. $\text{Add}(M)$) denotes the class of all direct summands in direct products (resp. direct sums) of copies of M . We will characterize the converse inclusion, under the usual set theoretic assumption that there are no measurable cardinals:

Theorem 1.1. *($V = L$) Let R be a unital ring and M be a right R -module. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\text{Add}(M) \subseteq \text{Prod}(M)$
- (2) M is Σ -pure injective.

In particular, it is well known that a ring R is right pure-semisimple if and only if there exists a right R -module M such that $\text{Mod-}R = \text{Add}(M)$, see [11, Proposition 2.6]. It is also important to know when we can write $\text{Mod-}R = \text{Prod}(M)$ for some right R -module M . One of the reasons comes from the theory of (co)homological functors on triangulated categories. After A. Neeman introduced Brown representability for the dual, [12], one of the main question is to find examples of triangulated categories $\mathcal{T}$ such that only one of the categories $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}^{\text{op}}$ satisfies the Brown Representability Theorem (BRT). One of idea was to find a (non pure-semisimple) ring R such that the homotopy category of complexes $\mathbf{K}(\text{Mod-}R)$ satisfies BRT for the dual, [9], i.e. to find a non pure-semisimple ring such that

Date: April 22, 2013.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 16D90, 18G35.

Key words and phrases. Σ -pure injective module; pure-semisimple ring; p -functor; Brown representability theorem; homotopy category.

Research supported by the CNCS-UEFISCDI grant PN-II-RU-TE-2011-3-0065.

$\text{Mod-}R = \text{Prod}(X)$, cf. [8]. This is not possible under the set theoretic hypothesis $(V = L)$.

Corollary 1.2. *($V = L$) Let R be a unital ring. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *R is right pure-semisimple (i.e. all right R -modules are pure-injective);*
- (2) *$\mathbf{K}(\text{Mod-}R)$ satisfies Brown Representability Theorem;*
- (3) *$\mathbf{K}(\text{Mod-}R)$ satisfies Brown Representability Theorem for the dual;*
- (4) *There exists $X \in \text{Mod-}R$ such that $\text{Mod-}R = \text{Add}(X)$;*
- (5) *There exists $X \in \text{Mod-}R$ such that $\text{Mod-}R = \text{Prod}(X)$.*

2. THE PROOFS

Let R be a unital ring. The main tool used in the proof of our theorem was proved in [3]. Recall that a functor $P : \text{Mod-}R \rightarrow \text{Mod-}\mathbb{Z}$ is called a p -functor if it is a subfunctor for the identity functor which commutes with respect direct products. We refer to [6] for basic properties of these functors. We note here that every p -functor commutes with respect direct sums, since it is a subfunctor for the identity functor. From the same reason, if P is a p -functor and $f : M \rightarrow N$ is a homomorphism, then $P(f) : P(M) \rightarrow P(N)$ is in fact the restriction of f to $P(M)$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $(U_i)_{i \in I}$ and $(V_j)_{j \in J}$ be two families of R -modules such that the set I is non-measurable. If $f : \prod_{i \in I} U_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j$ is a homomorphism and $(P_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a descending chain of p -functors defined on $\text{Mod-}R$ then there exist two finite subsets $I' \subseteq I$, $J' \subseteq J$, and an positive integer n_0 such that*

$$f \left(P_{n_0} \left(\prod_{i \in I \setminus I'} U_i \right) \right) \subseteq \bigoplus_{j \in J'} V_j + \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} P_n \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j \right).$$

Proof. The proof presented in [3, Theorem 2] is valid for our case, once we prove that the theorem is valid for the case I is countable. But this is proved in [13, Lemma 4].

In fact it is not hard to see that the topology defined on a direct product $U = \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} U_i$ by the set $\mathcal{B} = \{ \prod_{i > n} U_i \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \}$ as a basis of neighborhoods of 0 is complete and Hausdorff, hence we can also apply [3, Lemma 1]. $\square$

We also need the following elementary lemma:

Lemma 2.2. *Let $V = \bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j$ be a right R -module. For every $j \in J$ we fix a family of submodules $Y_j^n \leq V_j$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} Y_j^n \right) = \bigoplus_{j \in J} \left(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Y_j^n \right).$$

Proof. If $x = (x_j) \in \bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j$ is in $\bigoplus_{j \in J} Y_j^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (with $x_j \in Y_j$ for all $j \in J$) then for all $j \in J$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $x_j \in Y_j^n$ since the components x_j are unique with respect the direct decomposition $\bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j$. Then for all $j \in J$ we have $x_j \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Y_j^n$, hence $x \in \bigoplus_{j \in J} \left(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Y_j^n \right)$. Therefore $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} Y_j^n \right) \subseteq \bigoplus_{j \in J} \left(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Y_j^n \right)$. The converse inclusion can be proved in the same way. $\square$

Now we can prove the main result of this section:

Proposition 2.3. *Let $(U_i)_{i \in I}$ and $(V_j)_{j \in J}$ be two families of non-zero (right) R -modules such that $|I|$ is infinite and non-measurable and $|J| > |U_i|$ for all $i \in I$. Suppose that there exists an epimorphism $f : \prod_{i \in I} U_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j$.*

If $(P_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a descending family of p -functors defined on $\text{Mod-}R$ such that the homomorphisms $P_n(f)$ are epimorphisms for all n , then there exists $K \subseteq J$ such that

$$|K| \leq \max \left\{ \prod_{i \in I'} |U_i| \mid I' \subseteq I, \text{ and } I' \text{ is finite} \right\}$$

and the sequence $P_n(\bigoplus_{j \in J \setminus K} V_j)$ is stationary.

Proof. By Theorem 2.1, there exist two finite subsets $I' \subseteq I$, $J' \subseteq J$, and an positive integer n_0 such that

$$f \left(P_{n_0} \left(\prod_{i \in I \setminus I'} U_i \right) \right) \subseteq \bigoplus_{j \in J'} V_j + \bigcap_{n > 0} P_n \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j \right).$$

Since P_{n_0} is a subfunctor for the identity functor, $P_{n_0}(f)$ is the restriction of f to $P_{n_0} \left(\prod_{i \in I} U_i \right)$, hence $f \left(P_{n_0} \left(\prod_{i \in I} U_i \right) \right) \subseteq P_{n_0} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j \right)$. Therefore,

$$f \left(P_{n_0} \left(\prod_{i \in I \setminus I'} U_i \right) \right) \subseteq \left[\left(\bigoplus_{j \in J'} V_j \right) + \bigcap_{n > 0} P_n \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j \right) \right] \cap P_{n_0} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j \right).$$

Recall that the subgroup lattice of every abelian group is modular. Using this we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f \left(P_{n_0} \left(\prod_{i \in I \setminus I'} U_i \right) \right) &\subseteq \left[\left(\bigoplus_{j \in J'} V_j \right) \cap P_{n_0} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j \right) \right] + \left[\bigcap_{n > 0} P_n \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j \right) \right] \\ &= P_{n_0} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J'} V_j \right) + \left[\bigcap_{n > 0} P_n \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j \right) \right] \\ &= P_{n_0} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J'} V_j \right) + \left[\bigcap_{n > 0} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} P_n(V_j) \right) \right] \\ &= P_{n_0} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J'} V_j \right) + \left[\bigoplus_{j \in J} \left(\bigcap_{n > 0} P_n(V_j) \right) \right] \\ &= P_{n_0} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J'} V_j \right) + \left[\bigoplus_{j \in J \setminus J'} \left(\bigcap_{n > 0} P_n(V_j) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $P_{n_0}(f) : P_{n_0} \left(\prod_{i \in I} U_i \right) \rightarrow P_{n_0} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j \right)$ is an epimorphism, it follows that f induces an epimorphism of abelian groups

$$\bar{f} : \frac{P_{n_0} \left(\prod_{i \in I} U_i \right)}{P_{n_0} \left(\prod_{i \in I \setminus I'} U_i \right)} \twoheadrightarrow \frac{P_{n_0} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j \right)}{P_{n_0} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J'} V_j \right) + \left[\bigoplus_{j \in J \setminus J'} \left(\bigcap_{n > 0} P_n(V_j) \right) \right]}.$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{P_{n_0} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j \right)}{P_{n_0} \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J'} V_j \right) + \left[\bigoplus_{j \in J \setminus J'} \left(\bigcap_{n > 0} P_n(V_j) \right) \right]} &\cong \frac{\bigoplus_{j \in J \setminus J'} P_{n_0}(V_j)}{\bigoplus_{j \in J \setminus J'} \left(\bigcap_{n > 0} P_n(V_j) \right)} \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{j \in J \setminus J'} \frac{P_{n_0}(V_j)}{\bigcap_{n > 0} P_n(V_j)}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\left| \bigoplus_{j \in J \setminus J'} \frac{P_{n_0}(V_j)}{\bigcap_{n > 0} P_n(V_j)} \right| \leq |P_{n_0} \left(\prod_{i \in I'} U_i \right)| = \left| \frac{P_{n_0} \left(\prod_{i \in I} U_i \right)}{P_{n_0} \left(\prod_{i \in I \setminus I'} U_i \right)} \right|,$$

hence the cardinality of the set

$$L = \{j \in J \setminus J' \mid P_{n_0}(V_j) \neq \bigcap_{n > 0} P_n(V_j)\}$$

is at most $\max \{ \prod_{i \in I'} |U_i| \mid I' \subseteq I, \text{ and } I' \text{ is finite} \}$, hence $K = J' \cup L$ has the same property. Since for all $j \in J \setminus K$ we have $P_{n_0}(V_j) = P_n(V_j)$ for all $n \geq n_0$ and

p -functors commute with respect direct sums, the conclusion of our proposition is now obvious. $\square$

Corollary 2.4. *Let $(U_i)_{i \in I}$ and $(V_j)_{j \in J}$ be two families of (right) R -modules such that J is infinite, $|J| > |U_i|$ for all $i \in I$, and all modules V_j are isomorphic to a fixed module V .*

Suppose that I is non-measurable and there exists a pure epimorphism

$$f : \prod_{i \in I} U_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{j \in J} V_j.$$

Then V is Σ -pure injective.

Proof. It is easy to see that all finite matrix functors preserve pure epimorphisms. Therefore every decreasing sequence of matrix functors is stationary on V . By [6, Theorem 6], V is Σ -pure injective. $\square$

Remark 2.5. If the homomorphism f in the above results, Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 2.4, is split-epi then the proofs are valid for all descending families of p -functors.

The proof for Theorem 1.1. Since $\text{Add}(M) \subseteq \text{Prod}(M)$, it follows that for all sets J the right R -module $M^{(J)}$ is a direct summand of a direct product of copies of M . If we take J of cardinality greater than the cardinality of M , the conclusion follows from Corollary 2.4 (or Remark 2.5) since all cardinals are non-measurable. $\square$

The proof for Corollary 1.2. (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2) is proved in [11, Proposition 2.6], (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4) and (3) $\Rightarrow$ (5) follow from [9, Theorem 1 and Theorem 2]. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (5) follows from [11, Theorem 5.2], see also [8, Remark 3.3]. The implication (5) $\Rightarrow$ (1) follows from Theorem 1.1. $\square$

In [2, Question 12] G. Bergman asked if we can deduce that canonical embedding $R^{(\omega)} \rightarrow R^\omega$ splits provided that $R^{(\omega)}$ is a direct summand in R^ω . Corollary 2.4 can be used to provide a partial positive answer to this question.

Corollary 2.6. *Let M be a module of non-measurable cardinality κ . If $M^{(2^\kappa)}$ can be embedded as a direct summand in a direct product of copies of M (in particular in M^{2^κ}) then M is Σ -pure injective, hence the canonical embedding $M^{(\omega)} \rightarrow M^\omega$ splits.*

Finally, we mention that the condition $\text{Mod-}R = \text{Prod}(X)$ also appears as a characterization of rings which are copure-semisimple, i.e. all modules are copure-injective, (for terminology we refer to [4], [5] and [14]). We obtain an interesting corollary, about these rings:

Corollary 2.7. *($V = L$) A ring R is right pure-semisimple if and only if all right R -modules are copure injective.*

Proof. Suppose that R is right pure-semisimple. Using [10, Theorem 4.5.4] we observe that all finitely presented modules are cofinitely related, hence they are copure injective. But all modules are pure projective, hence all modules are direct summands of direct sums of finitely presented modules. Moreover, since all pure exact sequences split, it follows that every canonical embedding $0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} U_i \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} U_i$ splits, hence every module is a direct summand of a copure injective module. Therefore every module is copure injective.

Conversely, if every module is copure injective, then $\text{Mod-}R = \text{Prod } M$, where M is the direct product of all pairwise non-isomorphic copies of all cofinitely related modules, [5, Theorem 7]. The conclusion follows from Corollary 1.2. $\square$

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank to George-Ciprian Modoi who suggested me this topic, and for useful discussions on Brown Representability Theorems.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Angeleri-Hügel: On some precovers and preenvelopes, Habilitationsschrift, 2000 (available at <http://profs.sci.univr.it/~angeleri/files/buch.pdf>).
- [2] G.M. Bergman: *Two statements about infinite products that are not quite true*, (ed. by Chin, William et al.), Groups, rings and algebras. A conference in honor of Donald S. Passman, Madison, WI, USA, June 10–12, 2005. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS). Contemporary Mathematics 420 (2006), 35–58.
- [3] M. Dugas, M., B. Zimmermann-Huisgen: *Iterated direct sums and products of modules*, in Abelian group theory, Proc. Oberwolfach Conf. 1981, Lect. Notes Math. 874 (1981), 179–193.
- [4] D.J. Fieldhouse: *Pure theories*, Math. Ann. 184 (1960), 1–18.
- [5] V.A. Hiremath: *Copure-injective modules*, Indian J. pure appl. Math. 20 (1989), 250–259.
- [6] B. Huisgen-Zimmermann: *Purity, algebraic compactness, direct sum decompositions, and representation type*, Krause, Henning (ed.) et al., Infinite length modules. Proceedings of the conference, Bielefeld, Germany, September 7–11, 1998. Basel: Birkhäuser. Trends in Mathematics, (2000), 331–367.
- [7] H. Krause, M. Saorin: *On minimal approximations of modules*, In: Trends in the representation theory of finite dimensional algebras (ed. by E. L. Green and B. Huisgen-Zimmermann), Contemp. Math. 229 (1998), 227–236.
- [8] G.C. Modoi: *Brown representability dual for homotopy categories of complexes*, arXiv:1207.2113.v2.
- [9] G.C. Modoi, Šťovíček: *Brown representability often fails for homotopy categories of complexes*, J. K-Theory 9 (2012), 151–160.
- [10] M. Prest: *Purity, spectra and localisation*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications 121. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [11] J. Šťovíček: *Locally well generated homotopy categories of complexes*, Doc. Math. 15 (2010), 507–525.
- [12] A. Neeman: *Brown representability for the dual*, Invent. Math. 133 (1998), 97–105.
- [13] B. Zimmermann-Huisgen: *Rings whose right modules are direct sums of indecomposable modules*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 77 (1979), 191–197.
- [14] R. Wisbauer: *Foundations of Module and Ring Theory*, Gordon & Breach, Philadelphia 1991.

”BABEȘ-BOLYAI” UNIVERSITY, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, STR. MIHAIL KOGĂLNICEANU 1, 400084 CLUJ-NAPOCA, ROMANIA

E-mail address: bodo@math.ubbcluj.ro